

**CITY OF SHOREVIEW  
MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING  
March 14, 2016**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Martin called the workshop meeting of the Shoreview City Council to order at 7:00 p.m. on March 14, 2016.

**ROLL CALL**

The following attended the meeting:

City Council: Mayor Martin; Councilmembers Johnson, Quigley, Springhorn and Wickstrom

Staff: Terry Schwerm, City Manager  
Mark Maloney, Public Works Director  
Rebecca Olson, Asst. to City Manager

Turtle Lake	Tim Krinkie	Board President
Homeowners'	Mark Cossack	Board Secretary
Association:	Carl Schroeder	
	Joe Morris	

**MEETING WITH TURTLE LAKE HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION**

Mayor Martin opened the meeting. Introductions were made, and Mayor Martin turned the discussion over to the Board members attending from the Turtle Lake Homeowners' Association (TLHA).

In reference to the request sent to the City by the TLHA regarding management of the Turtle Lake water level, Mr. Krinkie noted that the City's Community Survey shows that 54% of non-lake homeowners use City lakes for recreation. There are public benefits to managing the water level of Turtle Lake. Turtle Lake Beach cannot be used when the lake level is low because of the muck. Many boats access the lake. For these public benefits, the Board is asking the City to be a partner in lake level management.

Mr. Krinkie distributed a list of next steps to move forward with a lake management plan. A number of Board members met with staff earlier in the day and had many questions answered with a review of the feasibility study. The Board would like to establish a Lake Improvement District (LID) for Turtle Lake, similar to Snail Lake. A major item is funding and cost allocation and how homeowners should share in the cost. Board members agree that decision should be with the City, whether it is a per lot cost, or by assessed value or by amount of shoreline. A

survey of questions is needed to determine the percentage of homeowners who support this project.

Mr. Maloney stated that the model used for the Snail Lake Improvement District identified all riparian properties for a per lot fee.

Mayor Martin reported a discussion at the Regional Council of Mayors meeting earlier in the day that focused on the quantity of water in the metro area. The question is whether there is enough water to sustain development in this region. The reaction to augmenting the level of a lake was incredulous. She added that she was not a supporter of the Snail Lake Improvement District when it was initially discussed and only supported it when it was demonstrated that the lake would disappear without augmentation. She believes a survey to homeowners should describe the worst case scenario indicating that homeowners would pay the entire cost of an augmentation project. Without the survey, it is not known at what level residents support this project. The survey and information to be presented at the Board meeting in May should indicate that if this project were to proceed, the cost might be \$2.5 million or more which would have to be divided by the 207 properties. If homeowners are willing under those circumstances to move forward, then the Council can decide whether to participate and at what level.

Councilmember Quigley stated that he would want to know exactly the feelings expressed by homeowners on any survey done to determine any City involvement. He sees any assessment on the value of property for homeowners who live on the lake and questioned any assessed value for non-riparian homeowners.

Councilmember Johnson noted the continuous communication about augmentation. It is important to involve a neutral party to conduct the survey and determine who, living on the lake, is willing to spend the money. She does not have a good understanding of who of the 207 are willing to participate in cost. Mr. Krinkie responded that in the first survey 88% indicated a willingness to participate, which is very strong. Homeowners are already paying a large amount of the cost to control invasive species.

Councilmember Quigley stated that the initial survey results are based on the culture of the lake community, not independent responses. A survey from an outside source might be more valid. Mr. Krinkie stated that the survey was by individual vote, one vote per house.

Councilmember Johnson stated that if she were a TLHA member, she would want any survey to describe the full picture of what it would cost her as a homeowner. She questioned whether enough technical information was available to all homeowners on the first survey to understand the full cost of augmentation.

Board members agreed that more technical information is now known from the feasibility study. There is also information on how clean the lake can be. A full engineering study is needed to have a solid cost. The biggest responsibility is to inform homeowners, and emotion needs to be taken out of the conversation and decision.

Mr. Cossack added that the question asked over and over by homeowners is to what extent the City will participate. There will be some who find it difficult to participate, but there will be financing for those who need it.

Mayor Martin stated that it would be difficult to support this project without knowing the level of support by homeowners on the lake. There are as many communicating with the Council on not supporting augmentation as those who support it. She is concerned that this is a divisive situation that could potentially bring lawsuits that could add to costs of the project. In order to prevail on assessments in a lawsuit, the City would have to prove benefit, which can be difficult. The fact that the lake level varies according to precipitation is different from Snail Lake or White Bear Lake. She would need to know that a strong majority of residents are asking for this project. In order to get that information, it is necessary to ask them if they would be willing to pay the full amount. If the City were to participate, the price would then be less.

Councilmember Wickstrom stated that if there are 207 properties around the lake and four are public, the maximum City support she would agree to would be 2%. Snail Lake is different because it would cease to exist without augmentation. That was proven a few years ago when zebra mussels were found and the augmentation pumping had to stop. The lake became a muddy mess. That is not the case with Turtle Lake, which varies in its level. Also, there is far more public land around Snail Lake than Turtle Lake. The 40% cost participation with Snail Lake is not nearly justified with Turtle Lake. The initial survey questions to TLHA homeowners were asked in such a way that solicited support. Misleading information was circulated ahead of the survey indicating the lake level would not likely rise again, but the lake level has risen. She stated her opposition to augmentation. However, if augmentation were to occur, she would want to be sure the water quality is not like Charlie Lake, which then flows to Pleasant Lake, then Sucker Lake and Snail Lake. There is a color difference between Snail Lake and Turtle Lake. Snail Lake water has a reddish, rust cast to it. If the Council wants to pursue this, she would want at least 80% to 85% of support from homeowners. There is a lot of opposition to an augmentation project from lakeshore owners.

Mr. Cossack stated that state statute defines support for a Lake Improvement District as needing 50+%. Mr. Schroeder stated that 51% voting yes and 49% voting no for a LID will not build community. The last survey was done in 2013, but the Board has much more information now that can be presented to homeowners in May.

Councilmember Wickstrom responded that the TLHA Board cannot form a LID on its own. A governmental taxing authority is ultimately needed to support a project.

Mr. Krinkie stated that one of the biggest issues is to communicate a realistic amount of homeowner share of the cost. The survey should not be done by the TLHA.

Mayor Martin agreed that the survey would have more credibility from a neutral party. There needs to be agreement between the Board and the City on the questions posed and how the cost is described. The cheapest route for a water source may not be the best. She is not sure that question should be in the survey.

Councilmember Johnson agreed and stated that it is better to rely on professional experts. Neither the Board nor the City should try to come up with the survey questions. Mr. Schwerm added that the consultant who conducts the City's Community Survey does municipal surveys all over the metro area, including referendums and working with specific taxing levels.

Councilmember Quigley stated that the next survey must identify the water source for augmentation, clarity level of the lake, screening as well as the costs. Engineering specifics need to be included in the survey.

Mr. Maloney expressed his concern that if the survey is too technical, an ability to analyze the technicalities will be needed to understand what is being asked. Mr. Cossack responded that it would be better to base the survey on a dollar level, not the technicalities of which source of water might be used. Depending on how much money is supported would determine the source and type of infrastructure.

Mr. Cossack asked what dollar amount should be used on the survey. Mayor Martin responded that the maximum cost should be used as if the City were not participating in the cost. If the City does participate, then the cost would be less to homeowners. Mr. Schwerm added that the cost estimate from SEH is at \$2 million to \$2.5 million. If the cost of \$2.5 million is used, then an assessment amount can be determined. The technical information can be communicated at the Annual Board meeting in May.

Mr. Schwerm stated that if there is 70% to 80% response to the survey, statistically it can be estimated that the remaining homeowners' responses would be similar to what was reported by those who responded. If there is a 30% response, there could be much more variation in the responses of those who did not respond. Phrasing of questions is important and should be reviewed by professionals who have expertise in survey design. Different parameters of cost can be used to find out what dollar amount would be supported.

Councilmember Quigley agreed with staff's recommendation to determine the level of property owner support with specific cost and potential assessments included in the survey. Determining the level of support needs to occur prior to any continuing discussion about cost sharing or the formation of a LID.

Councilmember Wickstrom asked what would happen if some people did not pay. Mr. Schwerm explained that assessments would be collected through annual tax payments. Non-payment would mean not paying taxes.

Councilmember Wickstrom expressed her added concern about precedent and where the Council should draw the line with residents on other lakes who have asked for help. An example is Kerry Lake. Those residents have asked the City for years to help clean the lake with dredging.

Councilmember Springhorn stated that this has become an intense issue. If there is not a high level of support from Turtle Lake homeowners, it would be difficult to ask other residents in the City to spend their tax dollars on this project.

Mayor Martin stated that SEH representatives will attend the Annual Meeting for TLHA on May 18, as well as Mr. Maloney. After that meeting when people are informed about the study, a professional survey consultant will be contacted to develop a survey with both the City and TLHA Board agreeing on the questions. Mr. Schwerm added that since there will be a limited number of questions, consultant work for the survey should not be too costly. There would be mail costs.

Mr. Krinkie stated he would like to see the survey prepared in time for the May meeting, when it could be handed out. People would take the survey home, answer the questions and mail it back.

### **REVIEW OF POTENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION FOR BOBBY THEISEN PARK**

Mr. Schwerm reported the property owner at 910 County Road E contacted the City to ask if there would be interest in purchase of the property to add to Bobby Theisen Park. After an initial discussion with the Council, staff was asked to contact the two adjacent property owners to find out their future plans. There are three residential properties surrounded by Bobby Theisen Park. The property at 910 sits between the other two. The owners at 902 County Road E responded that they had just completed significant reinvestment in their property and are not interested in selling. There has been no response from the property owner at 950 County Road E. As 910 is the middle property of the three, one option would be to acquire it and hold it until the City can acquire the other two properties before making an addition to the park. Until that time, options for rental could be explored. While these property acquisitions would be a nice addition, they are not critical to the park. Possible purchase was identified in the Comprehensive Plan but is not a priority at this time.

Councilmember Johnson noted that the property owner who has made a significant reinvestment must be planning to stay. One issue is there is no sidewalk along County Road E. She would only support acquisition if a trail would be included. Mr. Schwerm stated that the best time to put in a trail is with road work, which is not scheduled for some time. Staff explored extending the trail to Lexington Avenue when the Owasso Street realignment project was completed but it was expensive.

Mayor Martin stated that she would not want to purchase the property at 910 (the middle property) because the City could be held hostage by the other two properties. She suggested the three property owners be contacted about the City's interest in the long range future.

Councilmember Quigley agreed there is no current need. The timing is not right. This issue will be solved with time.

It was the consensus of the Council to not move forward with a purchase at this time.

### **REVIEW OF WILSON PARK IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Schwerm stated that the CIP for 2016 includes replacement of playground equipment and the addition of a park shelter at Wilson Park. These improvements have been delayed since 2012 due to other priorities. There are now some issues with the playground equipment. It cannot be

repaired because the equipment is so old parts are no longer available. Staff is recommending work with WSB Associates to prepare plans and specifications to replace the playground equipment and build a new park shelter. WSB is the consultant the City worked with on Sitzer and Bucher Park project. The Wilson Park Master Plan shows the playground being moved from the south side of the tennis courts to the north side to make it more accessible to those attending youth baseball games.

Councilmember Quigley expressed interest for the County hockey rink arena to be retained because it is used by young children. Mr. Schwerm stated that in addition to new refrigeration, it is his hope the County will also upgrade the outside appearance.

Councilmember Johnson stated that property owners build their own rinks in their back yards. It does not appear that usage for hockey rinks is as high as for social skating. Mr. Schwerm noted that there is a report showing usage of the rinks for the last 10 years that will be sent to the Council.

Mayor Martin questioned the popularity of hockey rinks and whether to focus on use of the County arena and not keep up local neighborhood park rinks. She does not want to spend a lot of money on relocating rinks but supports the plan to replace the playground equipment and put in a park shelter.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

### **Anniversary Celebration**

Mayor Martin noted that in one year the City will celebrate its 60th Anniversary. She asked how the Council would like to proceed in planning a celebration. It was the consensus of the Council to plan extra celebration recognition with the *Slice of Shoreview* but not as an elaborate celebration as the 50th.

### **Polling Site**

Mr. Schwerm reported that St. Odilia will no longer allow the school to be used as a polling place because of the concern with the school access. Staff believes the best option would be to combine precincts 1N and 2 and use the polling location at Shepherd of the Hills, which is an excellent polling location and has good access.

It was the consensus of the Council to combine precincts 1N and 2 to poll at Shepherd of the Hills.

The meeting adjourned.